ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ.—16-2-1949ರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಸನ್ನು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ transfer ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ application ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡರು, ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರು consider ಮಾಡಿ 25-3-49 ರಲ್ಲಿ dismiss ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆರ್. ರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಅಂದರೆ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರು 6-5-1949 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು judgment ಕೊಟ್ಟರೋ ಅದರಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆಯೂ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ.—ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡಿರತಕ್ಕ application consider ಮಾಡಿ ಅದನ್ನು dismiss ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆರ್. ರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಅಂದರೆ 6-6-1950 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರು ಯಾವ ಅಂಕಿಅಂಶಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೋ, ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ.—ಅದೇ separate ಆಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆರ್. ರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ revisional appeal 6-6-1950 ರಲ್ಲಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾದಂಥ ಕೇಸಿನಮೇಲೆ ಹೋಗಲಿಲ್ಲ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ —ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಸು final ಆಗಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಕೇಸನ್ನು transfer ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು application ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡರು. ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರು ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ appeal petition ನ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು decision ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. Lower Court ನಲ್ಲಿ ಆದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದ ಮೇಲೆ ತೀರ್ಪು ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆರ್. ರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರು ಯಾವ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ತೀರ್ಪು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಅನಮಂಜಸವಲ್ಲವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ.—Transfer ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರು. Transfer ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು petition reject ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—Mr. Speaker, the Minister is saying that the appeal was heard on 28th March 1949 but the District Court delivered the judgment on 6th June 1950. Evidently, the High Court has not heard the case either in revision or in appeal. I want the Minister to reply to that point.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—The suit was filed in the District Court on 22nd July 1948 and 16th February 1949. During that period he appealed to the High Court to get the case transferred to the High Court. But the High Court rejected the petition on 25th March 1949. The lower court decided the case and dismissed the suit on 6th June 1950.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—The High Court decided the point of transfer but not the judgment of 6th June 1950. I do not want to take any more time of this House. This question has to be examined by the Minister again because answers are incorrect.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—All aspects of the case of this official has been examined by the Court and they have dismissed it. The Government cannot interfere at this stage.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Are the Government aware that the judgment of the District Court stated that suspension and deduction in pay are departmental orders over which the Court has no jurisdiction and the Court cannot go into the propriety or otherwise of those orders?

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—That is the decision of the District Court.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Then, did the Government institute an enquiry under any other law?

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—There is no necessity because the President of the Municipal Council has compulsorily retired him for his misconduct and the Government cannot at this stage interfere and do anything.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Is it not necessary that the Public Enquiries Act of 1880 should have been brought into play in this case?

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—All those aspects have been considered and there are no good grounds to reconsider his case.

QUESTIONS FOR ANSWERS ON THE DAY

(but not taken up)

Depressed Class Graduates in Government Service.

Q.—496. **Sri J. NARAYANAPPA** (Chintamani—Scheduled Castes).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) the number of graduates in the depressed classes in the State; and their number in Government service;

(*b*) (i) how many persons of the depressed classes are in the grades of Amildars and Assistant Commissioners;

(ii) whether any person out of them has secured I.A.S. rank;

(iii) if not, the reason for the same?

A.—Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—

(*a*) The number of graduates belonging to the depressed classes in the State is 167. The number of graduates in the depressed classes in Government service is 95.

(*b*) (i) Amildars ... 8
Assistant Commissioners. 8

(ii) No.

(iii) The Special Recruitment Board which interviewed the State Civil Service Officers did not select any of them.

Rent paid by Government for Private Buildings in Tumkur.

Q.—516. Sri T. N. MUDALAGIRI GOWDA (Kunigal).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) the Government Offices, primary and old type Middle Schools that are being run in private buildings (Houses) in Tumkur Town and the persons to whom they belong;

(*b*) the amount of rent paid to each building (details to be given separately);

(*c*) the amount of house tax assessed by the Municipality on these buildings (figures to be given in respect of each building);

(*d*) whether the amount of rent fixed or paid by them is based on the assessment fixed by the Municipality or the Rent Control;

(*e*) whether it has come to their notice the owners are getting two to three times more than the actual value of the rent from the Government Treasury?

A.—Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—

(*a*), (*b*) and (*c*) Please see Statements I, II and III appended below.

(*d*) Generally on the suggestion of the House Rent Controller.

(*e*) No.